DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 445 UD 028 814

AUTHOR	Dianda, Marcella R.
TITLE	Adaptation and Implementation of Success for All: Progress Report.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.; Southwest Regional Lab., Los Alamitos, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Oct 91
CONTRACT	91002006
NOTE	49p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education Programs; *Compensatory Education; *Disadvantaged Youth; English (Second Language); High Risk Students; Hispanic Americans; *Limited English Speaking; *Minority Group Children; Primary Education; Program Development; Program Implementation; Reading Programs; School Restructuring; Spanish; *Spanish Speaking; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Progress Reporting; *Riverside Unified School District CA; Success for All Program

ABSTRACT

The Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) is adapting Success for All, a prominent early-elementary school program for at-risk minority youths, for use with disadvantaged limited English proficient students whose primary language is Spanish. The Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students is collaborating with the SWRL and the Riverside (California) Unified School District (RUSD) in adapting, implementing, and evaluating Success for All in a low-achieving disadvantaged elementary school with mostly Hispanic American students. The program strives to prevent learning deficits through a comprehensive approach that emphasizes early education, improvement in instruction and curriculum, and intensive intervention at the earliest possible stage when deficits first surface. The program includes the following: (1) English and Spanish reading tutors; (2) English and Spanish reading programs; (3) 8-week assessments administered in English and Spanish; (4) English and Spanish preschool and kindergarten programs; (5) a family support team; (6) an on-site Success for All facilitator; (7) grade-level teacher teams; and (8) a building advisory committee. The first year, 1991-92, is a phase-in year for Success for All, with full program implementation planned for 1992-93. This report describes accomplishments to date in the RUSD. Phase-in activities focused on implementing selected Success for All curricular components and key organizational features such as a school-based program facilitator. Joint activities of the SWRL and the Hopkins Center include development of Spanish Success for All materials and staff development. Included are 8 tables; 28 references; and an appendix containing 2 tables, a list of 50 Spanish Storytelling and Retelling (STaR) titles, and a STaR Program description. (RLC)

UD

The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory

4665 Lampson Ave., Los Alamitos, CA 90720

(213) 598-7661

ED 348445

Marcella R. Dianda
Southwest Regional Laboratory

October 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD 029 914

Adaptation and Implementation of Success for All: Progress Report

Marcella R. Dianda
Southwest Regional Laboratory

October 1991

Prepared under a subcontract with Far West Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (contract # 91002006, U.S. Department of Education). The content does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Far West Laboratory or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by these agencies.

CONTENTS

Abstract *v*

Introduction 1

Why Success for All 2

Success for All in Riverside Unified School District 5

Success for All Components 8

Project Implementation Timeline and Workscope 12

Progress in Adapting Success for All Curriculum Components 14

Progress in Implementing Success for All Program Components 15

Next Steps in Success for All Implementation 25

Evaluating Success for All 26

Summary 28

Appendix 29

References 41

TABLES

Table 1	Characteristics of Success For All School Site	7
Table 2	Success For All Program Components	8
Table 3	Multitrack Year-round Calendar at a Glance	16
Table 4	Success For All Reading Periods and Tutoring Assignments	18
Table 5	Success For All Initial and First Eight-week Assessments in Year-round Calendar School	21
Table 6	Elapsed Instructional Time Between Success For All Assessments	22
Table A-1	Initial Success for All Assessment Scores for Red and Blue Track Students	30
Table A-2	Initial and Eight-week Assessment Scores for Green and Yellow Track Students	32

ABSTRACT

Through its Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes (METRO) Center, the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) is adapting Success for All, a prominent early-elementary school program for at-risk minority youth, for use with disadvantaged limited English proficient (LEP) students whose primary language is Spanish. Success for All was developed and researched by the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, The Johns Hopkins University. The Hopkins Center is collaborating with SWRL and the Riverside Unified School District (RUSD) on adapting, implementing, and evaluating Success for All in a low-achieving, disadvantaged elementary school in which Hispanic students, 20% of whom are LEP, comprise the largest proportion of the student enrollment.

As implemented by SWRL, the purpose of Success for All remains the same as that envisioned by the program's developers: to ensure that every student in a high-poverty school will succeed in acquiring basic skills, particularly reading skills, in the early grades. The program is designed to prevent learning deficits through a comprehensive approach that emphasizes early education, improvement in instruction and curriculum, and intensive intervention at the earliest possible stage when deficits first begin to appear.

The first year, 1991-92, is a phase-in year for Success for All with full program implementation planned for 1992-93. Phase-in activities have focused on implementing selected Success for All curricular components and key organizational features, such as a school-based program facilitator. SWRL and the Hopkins Center are developing Spanish Success for All materials for implementation this school year and next year so that the program can be used appropriately with Hispanic LEP students. Other joint activities include staff development for the school staff on program components slated for immediate and future implementation. This report describes accomplishments to date.

INTRODUCTION

Through its Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes (METRO) Center, the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) has focused its institutional strengths on addressing schooling problems of educationally disadvantaged students in the Western region's metropolitan school districts. The METRO Center conducts research and development projects that support metropolitan school improvement. In addition, the METRO Center staff provides technical assistance to metropolitan educators working to improve the achievement of educationally disadvantaged students.

The METRO Center's technical assistance work is framed by three objectives relevant to the Success for All project. First, SWRL staff provide staff development, technical assistance, and evaluation services related to research-based and validated programs. Second, the Laboratory assists local sites as they develop organizational capacity to adopt school improvement programs. Third, technical assistance activities help schools adapt to validated program materials and processes so they meet the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse populations.

Success for All is a comprehensive restructuring program supported by an evolving research base that attests to its effectiveness. To date, it has produced substantial positive effects in schools serving primarily African American students (Slavin et al., 1990a, 1990b; Madden et al., 1991). However, the program has not yet been implemented to the same extent in low-achieving schools serving language minority (LM) students, although initial data from its use within the context of an immersion/English as a Second Language (ESL) program are promising (Slavin & Yampolsky, 1991). Most importantly, Success for All has not been implemented in a bilingual education context, the kind of instructional setting in which the nation's and region's largest LM student group, Hispanic students who are either non-English or limited-English speakers, receive instruction. Through the METRO Center, SWRL is working closely with Success for All developers at the Hopkins Center to adapt this complex program and extend it to LEP Hispanic students.

WHY SUCCESS FOR ALL

As Success for All's developers note, few coherent alternative instructional models and restructuring practices have been designed for schoolwide use in schools that serve academically at-risk children. Fewer still have convincing evidence that they result in increased student achievement (Madden et al., 1991).

Success for All has a proven track record. It was first implemented in the 1987-88 school year in an inner-city Baltimore elementary school. The developers have cited extremely positive first-, second-, and third-year results in schools that differ in location and in the level of resources available to implement Success for All. Comparisons between matched students in program and comparison schools have indicated strong positive effects on most individually administered reading measures, especially for students who have been in the program since first grade. Particularly large effects were found for low-achieving students (i.e., those who scored in the lowest quarter on standardized achievement tests). Similarly, retentions in grade and special education placements were reduced in Success for All schools.

The effects of Success for All on student performance have been reported in scholarly and practitioner journals and in the education and general press (*Washington Post*, Nov. 20, 1989; *Education Leadership*, 1989; *American Education Research Journal*, summer 1990; *Phi Delta Kappan*, April 1991; *Education Week*, Feb. 13, 1991; and *Harvard Education Newsletter*, January/February 1991).

An evolving research base strongly supports the effectiveness of Success for All in increasing student reading performance, particularly among Anglo and African American students. For example, reports of achievement gains in 1987-88, the first year the program was implemented in Baltimore schools, showed that the program brought all children at all grade levels to almost the 50th percentile on individually administered reading measures (the comparison school averaged about the 27th percentile (Slavin et al., 1990a).

Later findings indicated that students perform better the longer they are in the program. That is, larger effects were obtained at initial Success for All schools during their second year than in their first year in the program in first and second grades. In addition, the Hopkins researchers

have documented dramatic effects on the reading achievement of first graders who scored in the lowest 25% on pretests. On average, these low-achieving students—who received the lion's share of the program's most expensive resource, i.e., one-on-one tutoring—scored at the 46th percentile on individually administered reading tests. Matched low achievers in comparison schools averaged at the 8th percentile (Slavin et al., 1990b).

The most recent research evidence was reported for seven Success for All schools (Madden et al., 1991). Each of the schools was matched with a comparison school that was similar in the percentage of students receiving free lunch, historical achievement level, and other factors. Within each school, students were matched individually on standardized achievement scores from the spring before implementation began. All measures were the same individual student measures used by Slavin et al. (1990a, 1990b) and are described later in a discussion of plans to evaluate Success for All. Study outcomes are characterized in terms of effect size (ES), the difference between experimental and comparison means divided by the comparison group's standard deviation.

The seven schools included one school in which a majority of the students were Cambodian and arrived in kindergarten speaking little or no English. As a result, the program at this school incorporated elements directed at the needs of LEP students through intense ESL instruction and English immersion. Substantial positive effects were found for first graders on all four reading scales used (mean ES = +1.65) and for second graders (means ES =+1.00).

Results for students in grades 1-3 in the remaining six schools strongly supported Success for All. For first and second graders, statistically significant and substantial effects were seen on all reading measures, with an average effect size of +0.88. Effects for students in the lowest 25% on pretests were similar in magnitude (mean ES = +0.84), and were statistically significant on three of the four reading measures. Similarly, while third-grade effects were statistically significant only on one of the four measures, the mean effect sizes across all four measures were high (mean ES = +0.88).

Success for All also makes every effort to reduce grade retentions and special education placements. Grade retentions have dropped from 10, 11, and 12% in program schools to 1 or 2%, and in some cases, have been eliminated. Special education placements in Success for All schools have been eliminated altogether. Generally, students who perform two years below grade level are

among those placed in special education classes. Averaging across the four reading measures Hopkins researchers administered, no Success for All student performed this poorly.

Although Success for All needs to be tested in schools that serve large numbers of LM students, the research evidence to date is impressive. If it continues to be successful, particularly for LM students, Success for All will pose a challenge to traditional practices in compensatory and special education.

SUCCESS FOR ALL IN RIVERSIDE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Success for All is a complex program requiring careful planning and implementation. When SWRL made a commitment to install the program, we decided it was critical to begin small, document a successful implementation, and through that effort, garner support for program expansion. Consequently, the METRO Center's Success for All project centers on a single elementary school in one of the state's fastest-growing metropolitan counties, Riverside County. The project involves staff from SWRL; the Hopkins Center; the implementing school district, Riverside Unified School District (RUSD); and its Success for All adopter school, Fremont Elementary School.

The project is an outgrowth of an initial contact by RUSD's Chapter 1 Program administrator who approached SWRL after hearing the Hopkins Center staff describe Success for All at a national conference. Her question: Can a program that benefits underachieving African American and Anglo students work well with California's diverse student population, particularly Hispanic LEP students? Our response was a cautious "yes." Although not designed for use with LEP Hispanic students, SWRL's language development specialists felt that an appropriate adaptation for this student population was possible, appropriate, and feasible within the METRO Center's workscope.

The district and school staffs in Riverside were particularly interested in this extension of Success for All, given the changing demographics in California and RUSD. The state currently leads the nation in the proportion of LEP students it educates. That number rose from approximately 500,000 in spring 1984 to more than 860,000 in spring 1990—a 58% increase (CDE, 1990). The LEP population will continue to grow: Projections for the year 2000 put the state's LEP population at 1 million students (PACE, 1990). Hispanic students now comprise 73% of California's LEP student population.

Between 1985 and 1989, Riverside County experienced an 84% increase in the number of LEP students it educates (11,500 to nearly 21,000). The increase is even more dramatic in RUSD. In spring 1985, the district enrolled approximately 1,500 LEP students. By January 1990, that number increased 125% to more than 3,200 LEP students.

These demographic changes were mirrored in student performance on standardized achievement tests. For example, the reading scores of LEP Hispanic first graders on the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education (SABE) had declined since 1984-85, with students reading well below grade level (i.e., scoring at the 36th percentile in 1989-90). As disturbing, scores on the California Test of Basic Skills showed a similar trend. However, in this case, Hispanic and African American students' scores declined to below grade level.

As the district and school staffs discussed the achievement profiles of their schools, they identified high-poverty, high-need schools experiencing rapid demographic change. Fremont Elementary, the school in which the district elected to install Success for All, is among the district's most disadvantaged schools (see Table 1). It has a schoolwide Chapter 1 program, which means that at least 75% of the students qualify for free lunch. At one of the five largest elementary schools in RUSD, the prekindergarten through sixth-grade enrollment has increased steadily to 965. The student population was so overcrowded at the school that Fremont instituted a year-round school calendar on July 1, 1991.

The school's minority population also has increased dramatically. The Hispanic population increased from 34.7% in 1987 to 44% in 1991. Overall, minority students account for 61% of the student body. Approximately 15% of the student population was classified as LEP. The transiency rate at the school is 65%. The average parent occupational level at the school falls within the unskilled to skilled and semiskilled occupations as reported on the California Assessment Program (CAP) third- and sixth-grade testing. In addition, the school ranks second in the district in terms of the number of families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); approximately 30% of families qualify for this assistance.

Table 1
Characteristics of Success for All School

Characteristics	
Staffing	55
Teachers (preschool—grade 3)	20
Chapter I aides	5
Bilingual aides	6
Counselors	none
Psychiatrist	part-time
Bilingual community aide	1
Programs for children	
Preschool	yes
Kindergarten	half-day
School Calendar	year-round
Student Enrollment	965
Preschool	34
Kindergarten	119
Grade 1	135
Grade 2	146
Grade 3	133
Bilingual Classrooms	8
Student Ethnicity	
Hispanic	42%
Anglo	40%
African American	16%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1%
Other	1%
LEP students	20%
AFDC eligible	24%
Free lunch eligible	68%
Chapter 1	schoolwide

SUCCESS FOR ALL COMPONENTS

Success for All is a complex intervention with many school-level and curriculum components. Program components that SWRL and the Hopkins Center will implement to extend Success for All to Hispanic LEP students are listed in Table 2 and described briefly below.

Table 2
Success for All Program Components

Component	Description
English and Spanish reading tutors	Provide one-on-one tutoring to low-achieving students Function as additional reading teachers to reduce class size Administer informal reading assessments to students
English and Spanish reading programs	Homogeneously grouped students in grades 1-3 for reading STaR—Storytelling and Retelling Beginning Reading Beyond the Basics
Eight-week assessments administered in English and Spanish	Use curriculum-based assessments to assign tutors, change reading groups, identify other instructional needs
English and Spanish preschool and kindergarten programs	Build oral language and preliteracy skills through developmentally appropriate activities STaR Peabody Language Development kits
Family support team	Provides parenting education Involves parents in support of their children's learning Addresses home problems affecting student performance Includes a bilingual community aide as a member
On-site Success for All facilitator	Oversees Success for All operations at school site
Grade-level teacher teams	Forums for joint decisionmaking, sharing, problem solving
Building advisory committee	Provides support to principals in Success for All schools

Reading Tutors

The program's developers describe reading tutors as one of the most important elements of Success for All. As Wasik & Slavin (1990) note, "One-on-one tutoring of low-achieving primary-grade students is without a doubt one of the most effective instructional innovations available" (p. 11). Success for All tutors are certified teachers with experience teaching Chapter I students, special education, and/or primary reading.

Tutors work one-on-one for 20 minutes each day with students who are having trouble keeping up with their reading groups. Generally, the tutors focus on the same content and skills covered in regular instruction. However, the tutor also has the opportunity to identify learning problems and use different strategies to teach and reinforce the skills covered by the classroom teacher. During the Success for All 90-minute reading period, tutors serve as additional reading teachers to reduce class size for reading to approximately 15 students.

Finally, decisions about reading group placement and need for tutoring are based on informal reading inventories administered by the tutors. After this, reading group placements and tutoring assignments are made based on eight-week assessments, which include teacher judgment, as well as more formal assessments.

Reading Program

For most of the day, Success for All students are assigned to heterogeneous, age-grouped classes. During a daily 90-minute reading period, however, they are regrouped according to reading performance levels, and English proficiency, into classes with students at the same reading level.

The kindergarten and first-grade reading program emphasizes development of basic language skills with the use of Storytelling and Retelling (STaR), which involves students in listening to, retelling, and dramatizing children's literature (Karweit, 1988). Spanish STaR lessons developed by SWRL, Big Books that are available in Spanish and English, as well as oral and written composing activities, enable students to develop concepts of print as they develop knowledge of story structure. Peabody Language Development Kits are used to further develop receptive and expressive language skills.

In 1992-93, Beginning Reading will be introduced when students are ready, usually in the first grade. In this program, letters and sounds are introduced through activities that move from oral language to written symbols. Once letter sounds are taught, students are reinforced by reading stories that use the sounds. The program uses phonetically regular minibooks, emphasizes repeated oral reading to partners and to the teacher, and integrates reading and writing (Madden & Livermon, 1989).

As soon as students finish the Beginning Reading curriculum, they will move into Beyond the Basics, a component that extends and deepens reading skills by using cooperative learning methods. Beyond the Basics also will be introduced in 1992-93. Student activities include studying and practicing word lists and word meaning, reading selections silently and to a partner, discussing the selections with a partner and then writing individual answers to questions about text, demonstrating competence on oral and written tests, and extending learning by completing and sharing story-related writing. Again, a Spanish version of Beyond the Basics will be available for students.

Eight-week Reading Assessments

At eight-week intervals, reading tutors assess student progress through the reading program. Assessment results are used to determine who should receive tutoring, to change students' reading groups, to suggest other adaptations in students' programs, and to identify students needing other types of assistance. The Success for All assessments will be administered in Spanish to LEP Hispanic students.

Preschool and Kindergarten Programs

Like many Success for All schools, Fremont provides students with half-day preschool and half-day kindergarten. The preschool and kindergarten programs in Success for All focus on providing a balanced and developmentally appropriate learning experience for children. The curriculum emphasizes the development and use of language in Spanish for LEP Hispanic students and in English for other students. Thematic units, delivered in English or Spanish, integrate language, math, social studies, music, and art. Peabody Language Development Kits and the STaR program described earlier help foster language and literacy development.

Family Support Team

The Family Support Team provides parenting education and works to involve parents as partners in support of their children's success in school. Also, Family Support Team members are called upon to provide additional assistance when students seem to be working at less than full potential because of problems at home. The Family Support Team resembles approaches emphasized in James Comer's (1988) schoolwide restructuring model, which is effective in increasing student achievement over time.

On-site Success for All Facilitator

A program facilitator oversees (with the principal) the project. The facilitator helps plan Success for All; works with the principal on scheduling; and assists teachers on curriculum implementation, visits classrooms, conducts training sessions for teachers and tutors, and serves as a liaison to the family support team's activities.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND WORKSCOPE

1991-92 is a phase-in year for Success for All at Fremont School, with full program implementation planned for 1992-93. This implementation timeline was adopted for several reasons. First, Fremont's principal recommended against full-scale Success for All implementation in 1991-92 because the school was already implementing a major change this year: conversion to a year-round school calendar.

Second, the school faculty felt strongly that Fremont implement the program "with parity (i.e., with a full-fledged Spanish component). Since Success for All materials were only available in English pending the development work undertaken as part of SWRL's implementation, all parties agreed to use the 1991-92 school year for the development of Spanish Success for All curriculum materials.

Third, the district's early elementary reading program for English-speaking students, Houghton Mifflin *Literary Readers,* is structurally different from Success for All's Beginning Reading program. For example, while the K-1 Beginning Reading program uses a series of phonetically regular minibooks in oral and silent reading (Madden & Livermon,1989), the Houghton Mifflin program does not. In addition, the tutoring model included in Success for All is closely integrated with the Beginning Reading program. The Houghton Mifflin program does not include a tutorial component. SWRL, the Hopkins Center, and Fremont's principal and Success for All facilitator agreed to take the 1991-92 school year to acquaint Fremont staff more thoroughly with Success for All Beginning Reading and ease the transition to the program in 1992-93.

Fourth, while the district's early reading program for Spanish-speaking students, *Campanitas del Oro* from McMillan, is structurally more compatible with Success for All Beginning Reading, activities that are used in the Hopkins-developed reading program need to be developed for use with *Campanitas del Oro*. This work is being undertaken by the SWRL-Hopkins Center collaboration in 1991-92.

In 1991-92, then, SWRL is focusing much of its effort on the curriculum development required to extend Success for All for use with limited English-speaking Hispanic students. Initial work has centered on developing Spanish lessons for one Success for All curriculum component, STaR. In addition, SWRL staff are working with Fremont Elementary School to put the following key Success for All components in place: STAR, Peabody Language Development Kits, on-site

facilitator, reading tutors, initial student assessments, and eight-week assessments within the context of a year-round school calendar. Hopkins Center staff are working with Fremont to implement another key Success for All component, a school-based Family Support Team.

PROGRESS IN ADAPTING SUCCESS FOR ALL CURRICULUM COMPONENTS

In 1991-92, SWRL is working with Fremont to install the STAR component of Success for All. Designed for prekindergartners, kindergartners, and first graders, STaR emphasizes development of comprehension, oral communication, and motivation to read through reading stories and discussing them. The program is particularly enriching for disadvantaged children who come to school with little or no experience with books or reading.

STaR implementation began mid-July at Fremont. Prior to that start date, SWRL worked with a four-member teacher development team from another RUSD elementary school to develop an initial set of 20 Spanish STaR lessons. This was so that Fremont could begin the school year with lessons for its LEP Hispanic kindergartners and first graders (see Appendix for development guidelines).

As agreed with the Hopkins Center, SWRL will develop 100 Spanish STaR lessons, along with teacher directions and support materials. Fifty lessons have been completed to date, with the rest slated for completion next quarter. SWRL has sought external review of the first 50 lessons by the Hopkins Center, two Success for All sites in Modesto, CA, and Fremont teachers as they use the materials (See Appendix for list of STaR lesson titles and SWRL's request for external review). The stories around which the lessons are structured were selected by Fremont teachers, the four-member development team, and SWRL. They represent a mixture of stories listed on California's Spanish core literature lists, Spanish trade books, Big Books in Spanish, and other Spanish language arts materials in use in the district.

PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING SUCCESS FOR ALL PROGRAM COMPONENTS

In addition to curriculum development, SWRL is providing technical assistance to Fremont during the 1991-92 school year to put key Success for All components in place. Project accomplishments include the following.

On-site Success for All Facilitator Selected

Success for All is implemented by teachers under the leadership of a Success for All program facilitator who is responsible for the program's day-to-day operation. The principal's designee, Fremont Elementary School's Success for All facilitator is a Chapter I resource teacher who assumed her position in spring 1991. She brings to her facilitator role 25 years of classroom teaching experience and four years as a Chapter I program coordinator.

Fremont's facilitator: (a) oversees development and administration of initial assessments and grouping of students for English and Spanish language arts instruction; (b) coordinates one-on-one tutorial sessions including content of instruction; (c) develops and monitors eight-week assessments and adjusts learning programs to fit the individual needs of students; (d) conducts staff development inservices in the use of STaR and the Peabody Oral Language Development Kit; (e) meets regularly with Chapter I and classroom teachers for ongoing program planning and evaluation; (f) serves as the materials resource person for prekindergarten through sixth grade; (g) conducts regular classroom observations of program, delivery, equal access, and students at risk; (h) refers students making little or no growth to the Family Support Team for additional intervention; (i) coordinates her activities with those of the Family Support Team; and (j) meets monthly with SWRL staff and coordinates all SWRL classroom observations and school visitations.

Success for All Training Conducted

To prepare for the 1991-92 Success for All phase-in and to initiate the development activities planned for this period, SWRL and the Hopkins Center conducted several training activities. First, in early spring, SWRL staff, the principal, Success for All facilitator, and selected staff members attended a four-day training session for facilitators conducted by the Hopkins Center. This training provided an overview of all the program's components. Second, Hopkins Center and SWRL staff

conducted a one-day training session on STaR and the use of Peabody Language Development Kits for Fremont's prekindergarten through first-grade teachers and aides. Third, SWRL conducted a one- and one-half day training session for a team of bilingual teachers who worked with the Laboratory's language development staff to write Spanish STaR lessons. Fourth, in early fall, Hopkins Center staff provided a one-day training for Fremont administrative staff on creating the school's Success for All Family Support Team.

Success for All Implementation Scheduled in Year-round Setting

On July 1, Fremont adopted a multitrack year-round school calendar to ease overcrowding. Fremont is one of seven elementary schools in RUSD to change to a year-round calendar, a trend that will increase over the next few years as the district's enrollment continues to increase. More than 1,200 schools statewide currently operate under year-round calendars (CDE, 1991).

Like many districts, RUSD adopted a 60/20 year-round calendar—60 days of instruction followed by 20 days of vacation, repeated three times during the school year. The multitrack feature of the calendar divides the student body and staff into four different tacks (Green, Red, Blue, and Yellow). At any one time, three of the four tracks attend school, while the fourth track is on vacation. When the fourth track of students returns from vacation, another track leaves. In this way, the student population rotates in and out of school, one track replacing another on vacation. (see Table 3)

Table 3
Multitrack Year-round Calendar at a Glance

Track	Begin School	Off track	Resume school	Off track	Resume school	Off track	Resume school	End school
Yellow	7/1	8/23	9/24	12/20	2/3	4/17	5/26	6/26
Green	7/1	9/20	10/21	12/20	1/6	1/24	2/24	5/22
Red	7/30	10/18	11/18	2/4	3/24	6/26[1]	---	---
Blue	7/1	7/28	8/28	11/15	1/6	3/17	4/20	6/26

[1]June 26 is the last day of school for Red Track students

By changing to a multitrack year-round calendar, Fremont increased its student seating capacity by 20-25%. In return, the school staff took on a sophisticated planning and scheduling task, made even more challenging by the Success for All phase-in. That is, as the school began to put the four-track, year-round calendar in place, the principal, Success for All facilitator, and teaching staff also implemented: (a) one-on-one tutoring; (b) initial Success for All assessments; (c) eight-week Success for All assessments; (d) STaR and Peabody Language Development Kits; and (e) the communication and administrative mechanisms required to implement Success for All in prekindergarten through first grade.

Reading Tutors Identified and Tutoring Schedule Set

Prior to the start of the school year, Fremont identified four reading tutors for prekindergarten to first-grade students. All are certificated Chapter 1 resource teachers. A bilingual Chapter 1 resource teacher filled a fifth tutoring slot.

During language arts instruction, each of the tutors functions as a second reading teacher by working with small groups of homogeneously grouped children on STaR, Peabody, or reading skills, while the teacher provides similar instruction to another group of homogeneously grouped children. In this way, class size is reduced during much of the language arts period. During the rest of the day, the tutors conduct one-on-one tutoring sessions with high-need students, as determined by the initial and eight-week Success for All assessments. As Table 4 illustrates, tutors spend 40 to 120 minutes per day tutoring.

The last tutor listed in the table, Tutor E, is the bilingual resource teacher. All students who are not on bilingual individualized learning plans (BILPs), and who receive bilingual instruction, are in two Yellow Track first grades. Since neither first-grade teacher in this track is bilingual, the classes are split during morning reading instruction, and the bilingual resource teacher provides reading instruction to the bilingual students. She then provides two hours of one-on-one tutoring to LEP students in the afternoon.

Table 4
Success for All Reading Periods and Tutoring Assignments

Tutor	Tchr.	Track	Grade	Success for All Duties
A	7	Green	1st	Second reading teacher in a.m.; tutors 40 minutes in p.m.
	1	Green	K-1	Second reading teacher, p.m.; tutors 40 minutes, p.m.
B	5	Blue	1st	Second reading teacher, a.m.; tutors 2 hours, p.m.
C	3	Red	1st	Second reading teacher, a.m.; tutors 1 hour 20 minutes, p.m.
D	9	Blue	K	Serves as second teacher in kindergarten and pre-K throughout school day
	10	Red	Pre-K	Same as above
	11	Red	K	Same as above
	10	Red	Pre-K	Same as above
E	6	Yellow	1st	Provides reading instruction to LEP students in a.m.
	7	Yellow	1st	Tutors two hours in p.m.

To ease the transition to a multitrack year-round calendar and to make maximum use of one-on-one tutorials, the resource teachers elected to work four days a week (Tuesday —Friday) throughout the school year. When the teacher and students they are assigned to assist rotate off track, the tutor picks up other high-need students for tutoring. In addition, given the school's high transiency rate, each tutor has a list of alternate or back-up students they tutor on days that the students they normally work with are absent.

STaR and Peabody Implementation Begins

The curricular focus of initial Success for All implementation at Fremont is STaR, "a set of procedures and materials to help structure storytelling and retelling in preschool and kindergarten classes" (Karweit, 1990). As in many Success for All schools, Fremont also uses STaR with first graders. Designed for a whole-class format with a teacher and a teacher's assistant present, the program has five major components: (a) story introduction; (b) storytelling; (c) story review; (d) group story retelling; and (e) individual story retelling. The activities take about 30 minutes a day. The storytelling takes one day and the story retelling takes another day. That is, the five STaR activities take two days to complete. At the beginning of the school year, two stories are typically covered in one week. The fifth day is used for dramatic play, retelling another story, or for other extension activities the teacher plans. Since implementing STaR in Yellow and Green Track classrooms in mid-July, Fremont teachers in all four tracks have worked to teach two STaR lessons per week.

In addition to STaR, the school uses Peabody Language Development Kits, "structured, highly entertaining activities [that] are carefully sequenced to promote language development by engaging students interactively." The kit includes puppets and a variety of objects that support discussion of new concepts and ideas.

In grade 1, STaR and Peabody are incorporated into a 1-hour and 30-minute language arts instructional block, along with the district's literature-based Houghton Mifflin reading series, *Literary Readers*, thematic units, and Big Books. Rather than using the two-week thematic units that are part of Success for All, the school uses longer units developed by teachers that link science, social studies, math, and language arts activities together by means of a common instructional theme. The language arts period is divided into three periods with students spending approximately 30 minutes on STaR, Peabody, and skills, and 45 minutes on the Houghton Mifflin reading series. In kindergarten, STaR, Big Books, thematic units, and Houghton Mifflin reading readiness activities are incorporated into the half-day program. At the preschool level, instruction focuses on STaR, Big Books, Peabody, and thematic units.

Success for All for LEP Students Structured

One of the unique features of Success for All at Fremont is the use of the program with LEP Hispanic students who receive bilingual education services. To date, implementation has focused on grade 1, which has two bilingual classrooms. During the language arts block, the LEP students (n = 24) in these classes receive STaR and Peabody instruction in Spanish from the bilingual resource teacher and two trained bilingual teacher aides. As is the case with English instruction, 30 minutes are devoted to STaR and 30 minutes to Peabody. The remaining time is spent with the district's Spanish reading series, McMillan's *Campanitas del Oro*.

Fremont has structured instruction so that the trained aides work under the guidance of the two regular classroom teachers, while the resource teacher takes a group of students to a different classroom and works with them. For example, Ms. Downey teaches STaR to a group of English-speaking students from her class and from Ms. Diamond's classroom. The most able Spanish readers remain in Ms. Downey's classroom and receive STaR instruction from a trained aide. The medium-level Spanish readers remain in Ms. Diamond's classroom for Peabody instruction in Spanish by a trained classroom aide. The least proficient Spanish readers from both classes work with the bilingual resource teacher on STaR in another classroom.

Success for All Assessments Conducted

As of Oct. 1, Fremont had conducted initial assessments of all first graders to place them in homogeneous reading groups. The eight-week assessments provide frequent checks of individual students' achievement so that students who have begun to develop at a faster rate can move to a more challenging program and those who are not meeting success can be placed in a different group and/or provided one-on-one tutoring.

Fremont modeled its initial assessment packet on the one provided in Success for All. They assessed students' (a) knowledge of the letters of the alphabet (letter recognition); (b) knowledge of letter sounds (sound recognition); (c) ability to write the letters of the alphabet (written recognition); (d) knowledge of frequently used sight words (sight works); ability to use sounds to write words (writing assessment of phonetically spelled words); ability to tell a story in the sequence of first, next, and last (sequence); and (e) ability to answer higher-level comprehension questions based on a reading passage read to the student (comprehension). Unlike the Hopkins

Center-developed initial assessments, the assessment did not include the Durrell silent reading form nor were students asked to read a passage silently or orally. These items were not included, based on the facilitator's, principal's, and teachers' assessments that students were not yet prepared for these tasks, given their limited knowledge of the recognition skills mentioned above and their limited familiarity with sight words.

In addition, the school has opted to implement Success for All periodic assessments prior to installing Beginning Reading, the Success for All curriculum component to which the assessments are tied. Therefore, the eight-week assessments also were modified slightly so they were more compatible with the Houghton Mifflin reading series. Like the initial assessment, the first round of eight-week assessments did not include a reading passage. Plans call for incorporating passages from the Houghton Mifflin and McMillan reading programs or basal readers into subsequent assessments.

Since the eight-week assessments were administered within the context of the multitrack year-round calendar, they were actually administered at five- to eight-week intervals depending on the particular student track (see Table 5). For example, Yellow Track students were assessed after 20 days of Success for All instruction had elapsed, while Blue Track students will receive their first assessment after 39 days of Success for All instruction.

Table 5
Success for All Initial and First Eight-week Assessments in Year-round Calendar School

Track	Begin School	Off track	Resume school	Initial asses.	8-week asses.	Elapsed instructional days	Off track	Resume school
Yellow	7/1	---	---	7/16	8/19-22	20	8/23	9/24
Green	7/1	---	---	7/16	9/17-20	36	9/20	10/21
Red	7/30	---	---	8/13	10/14	36	10/18	11/18
Blue	7/1	7/28	8/28	9/3	11/4-8	39	11/15	1/6

Table 6 shows the number of elapsed instructional days between Success for All assessments for the rest of the school year.

Table 6
Elapsed Instructional Time Between Success for All Assessments

	Elapsed instructional days		
Track	Initial, 1st eight week	1st, 2nd eight week	2nd, 3rd eight week
Yellow	20	43	40
Green	36	27	48
Red	36	35	52
Blue	39	39	36

Results of Initial Assessments Guide One-on-One Tutoring and Grouping

Assessment results were used to create homogeneous reading groups and to identify students for one-on-one tutoring. Students identified for tutoring were those who received the lowest numerical score on the assessment, and who in the teachers' judgment were in the most need of tutoring. The number of students who were subsequently placed in tutoring was limited by the number of available tutors. Of the 175 students assessed across all four tracks, 35 were placed in the tutoring program. Results of the first eight-week assessment administered to Yellow and Green Track students showed that in all but one case, students showed gains. Yellow Track includes 24 LEP Hispanic students, 6 of whom received daily tutoring from the bilingual Chapter 1 teacher/tutor. Only one of the students failed to show any gain.

Tables A and B in the Appendix present per-student breakdowns of assessment information. The tables also provide information on the number of students who either moved into or out of these first-grade classrooms between July 1 and the third week in September. Of the total number enrolled (n = 175), 21 or 12% either left or entered Fremont.

Family Support Team Established

In September, staff from the Hopkins Center met with the principal and staff to discuss the creation of a Success for All Family Support Team. For example, due to district budget cutbacks, some of the individuals who would normally serve on the Family Support Team (e.g., school nurse, child welfare and attendance worker) had either been laid off or reassigned to other schools with higher need. Consequently, the school filled a medical practitioner slot on the team by calling on three individuals to volunteer their time on a rotating basis—a medical doctor who was formally on the district's school board, a nurse from the University of California, Riverside, and a nurse who is a friend of a school staff member. In addition, the child welfare and attendance worker agreed to volunteer at Fremont in the mornings and work with the team when needed. Staff from a youth service center will work at Fremont in the afternoons. These services will be augmented by a school resource officer, a police officer assigned to a school cluster that includes Fremont. Other team members include the school psychologist, a speech language pathologist, and a resource teacher. The team meets after school once a week. Team members also are available to meet with parents before school.

In addition to discussing interventions to meet the needs of specific students who are referred to the team by teachers, the Family Support Team is working on two other initiatives: (a) a school buddy program in which a faculty member acts as a buddy to an individual student; and (b) a volunteer listening program in which community members will come to listen to individual students read.

Teacher Teams and Communication Established

One of the most important features of Success for All is its implementation by classroom teachers who operate as members of a team under the leadership of the on-site facilitator. At Fremont, each Success for All teacher and his/her assigned Chapter 1 resource teacher/tutor meet bi-weekly to discuss Success for All lessons and assess the progress of individual students. In addition, the facilitator meets approximately every two weeks with all teachers, tutors, and instructional aides to address problems, answer questions, provide updates and briefings about program components and implementation, and plan next steps in Success for All implementation. The facilitator stays in frequent contact with the teachers and aides and observes their instruction periodically. In the future, the principal will observe STaR and Peabody lessons with the facilitator.

SWRL Classroom Observation Schedule Set

SWRL staff observe STaR, Peabody, language arts instruction, and one-on-one tutoring approximately monthly. During the year, observations will include prekindergarten and first-grade classrooms. We observe English and Spanish instruction on each occasion.

Observations Conducted and Feedback Provided

To date, SWRL staff have observed kindergarten and first-grade classrooms. Initial observations in mid-August focused on STaR Spanish and English lessons. These initial observations showed that although early in the STaR implementation, with one exception, the teachers and bilingual aides were using the STaR lesson structure. At SWRL's recommendation, the facilitator provided additional support to one bilingual aide who was not implementing STaR to familiarize her with the SWRL-developed lessons and train her in their use.

Subsequent observations were conducted in first-grade English and bilingual classrooms. The bilingual classroom observation, which included an opportunity to view one-on-one tutoring, indicated that the Chapter 1 resource teacher and trained aides are: (a) implementing STaR using the curriculum materials developed by SWRL; (b) using reading readiness activities as part of *Campanitas del Oro* that parallel the phonetically-based reading approach in Success for All Beginning Reading; and (c) providing one-on-one tutoring as detailed in Success for All. Observations of English instruction documented continued fidelity to the structure of STaR, good use of Peabody language development strategies, and a need to increase in-class reading time for students (see discussion below)..

NEXT STEPS IN SUCCESS FOR ALL IMPLEMENTATION

As Fremont phases in Success for All, several additions are planned to the program components the school has begun to implement. First, Fremont will increase its emphasis on students' reading. One of the key pedagogical tenets of Success for All is that "students, regardless of their strengths or weaknesses, learn to read by reading" (Wasik & Madden, 1990). Now that teachers are comfortable using the oral language development program, STaR, the school staff feel it is time to focus on reading during Houghton Mifflin instruction, as part of the eight-week assessments, and, has been the case, in one-on-one tutoring.

With respect to tutoring, the staff will refine their efforts by adding a diagnostic feature included in Success for All. That is, as students enter one-on-one tutoring, tutors will administer an individual assessment. The purpose of the assessment is to find out what the student knows and how (s)he approaches reading. Tutors diagnose and assess a student's reading problems by observing the student read. The information obtained from the assessment will be used to develop a diagnostic plan for each student that will, in turn, guide what the tutors work on during tutoring and what they address first.

As part of the eight-week assessments, the school will add reading passages either from the Houghton Mifflin readers or basal readers. Modeled on passages used in the eight-week assessments conducted in conjunction with Beginning Reading, a number of passages of increasing difficulty will assess students' decoding, word attack, and fluency skills.

The school also plans to place the Success for All reading tutors in classrooms during Houghton Mifflin reading instruction so that the tutors can function as a second reading teacher. Currently, the classroom teacher provides whole-class instruction during this 45-minute period. With the assistance of a second teacher, homogeneous reading groups can be maintained and students will have increased opportunities to learn to read by reading.

As the year progresses, Fremont staff will participate in a series of training activities to prepare the staff for Success for All Beginning Reading and Beyond the Basics in 1992-93. In January, the facilitator and selected teachers will attend a Hopkins Center-conducted training in Beginning Reading. With the assistance of Hopkins Center staff, SWRLwill train teachers in Beginning Reading and Beyond the Basics training will be conducted with second- and third-grade teachers, and Hopkins Center staff will provide additional training to the Family Support Team .

EVALUATING SUCCESS FOR ALL

When Success for All is fully implemented, SWRL will employ the evaluation/research design used by the Hopkins Center to assess the program's effects, thereby enabling comparisons with the Success for All research base. Fremont will be matched with a comparison school in RUSD that is similar in the percentage of students receiving free lunch, historical achievement data, and other factors. Within each matched school, students will be matched individually on standardized achievement scores from the previous string. All measures will be the same as those administered by Slavin et al. (1990) and Madden et al. (1991). They will be administered to all English-proficient program and comparison students in the spring. Each is described below.

Two receptive and expressive language tests individually administered to preschool and kindergarten students are the Test of Language Development (TOLD) (Newcomer & Hammill, 1988) and the Merrill Language Screening Test (Mumm, Secord, & Dykstra, 1980). Individually administered Picture Vocabulary and Sentence Imitation Scales from the TOLD will be used to assess receptive and expressive language concepts, respectively. The individually administered comprehension scale from the Merrill Test is used to assess the ability to understand complex story structure of preschool and kindergarten students.

With respect to reading, four individually administered reading scales from two widely used nationally standardized reading batteries assess a full range of reading skills. The reading batteries are the Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery (Woodcock, 1984) and the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (Durrell & Catterson, 1980).

Two Woodcock scales, Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack, are individually administered to students in grades K-3. The Letter-Word scale assesses recognition of letters and common sight words, while the Word Attack scale assesses phonetic synthesis skills.

Two Durrell scales, Oral and Silent Reading, are administered to students in grades 1-3. Oral Reading presents a series of graded reading passages that students read aloud, followed by comprehension questions. The Silent Reading scale also uses graded reading passages that students read silently. Both Oral and Silent Reading contain assessments of

reading comprehension. Oral Reading focuses on decoding and sight vocabulary, while Silent Reading focuses more on comprehension.

Data from these assessments are analyzed using analyses of covariance, with pretests as covariates. Outcomes are characterized in terms of effect sizes, which are differences between the program and comparison student means divided by the comparison group's standard deviations.

The SWRL-Hopkins Center-school district partnership also will undertake the identification of appropriate Spanish assessment measures to assess the performance of LEP Hispanic students participating in Success for All.

A history of research dating back to the 1930s on the language background in the measurement of achievement and aptitude in Hispanic populations exists (Sanchez, 1932; Diaz, 1983; Duran, 1983, 1989; Olmedo, 1977; & Padilla, 1979). In general, these studies suggest that test scores may underestimate the academic performance of nonnative speakers of English. That is, a test in English becomes primarily a language proficiency test rather than one of achievement or aptitude for persons whose best language is not English (Alderman, 1982; Duran, Enright, & Rock, 1985). As important, some types of questions are differentially harder or easier for bilingual students owing to the particular linguistic features of the question (Alderman & Holland, 1981; Breland, 1974; Chen & Henning, 1985; Schmitt, 1986). Therefore, in conducting Success for All, SWRL will employ measurement instruments in Spanish to accurately measure the program's effects on LEP students.

Given the high student transiency rate at Fremont, SWRL will compare the performance of three groups of students: (a) "full treatment" students who receive Success for All for a full year; (b) students who will have some involvement with the program, but will move into or out of one of the participating schools during the year; and (c) students in the comparison schools.

SUMMARY

In many Success for All sites, school staffs have elected to install the entire program at once. This is not the case at Fremont Elementary School due to a number of factors, including the school's transition in 1991-91 to a multitrack, year-round school calendar, and the need to develop curriculum materials in Spanish for LEP Hispanic students.

The principal and Success for All facilitator know their staff well and believe that slow steady implementation of individual pieces of Success for All is the best way to install the program. Considerable progress was made in installing STaR, Peabody, one-on-one tutoring, and the Family Support Team between April 1 and Oct. 1. As important, the principal designated a facilitator who has organized the program components well and built support for each component among the prekindergarten through first-grade teaching staff, instructional aides, and the resource teacher/tutors.

Next steps in the Success for All implementation will enable the school to refine and more fully implement initial program components and prepare for full implementation in 1992-93. These include: (a) additional training in the school's Family Support Team in family-centered outreach strategies to more fully involve parents in students' learning; (b) training in Beginning Reading and Beyond the Basics; and (c) continued implementation and monitoring of STaR and Peabody.

Appendix

Table A-1
Initial Success for All Assessment Scores for Red and Blue Track Students

Student ID	Teacher ID	Track	Score on initial assessment	Identified for tutoring	Special notes
001	3	Red	57		
002	3	Red	42		
003	3	Red	13	X	
004	3	Red	57		
005	3	Red	9	X	
006	3	Red	145		RSP/S[1]
007	3	Red	48		
008	3	Red	7	X	Moved
009	3	Red	10	X	
010	3	Red	49		
011	3	Red	48		Moved
012	3	Red	42		
013	3	Red	56		
014	3	Red	7	X	
015	3	Red	48		
016	3	Red	57		
017	3	Red	59		
018	3	Red	44		
019	3	Red	49		
020	3	Red	46		
021	3	Red	62		
022	3	Red	--		Moved
023	3	Red	57		Moved
024	3	Red	47		
025	3	Red	53		
026	3	Red	37		
027	3	Red	9		
028	3	Red	27	X	
029	3	Red	52		
030	3	Red	47		
031	3	Red	39		
032	3	Red	--		Moved
033	3	Red	2	X	
034	3	Red	40		Moved
035	3	Red	57		
036	2	Red	1		
037	2	Red	50		
038	2	Red	39		
039	4	Blue	50		
040	4	Blue	44		GATE[2]

[1] Special education student; [2] Student identified as gifted and talented.

table continues

Student ID	Teacher ID	Track	Score on initial assessment	Identified for tutoring	Special Notes
041	4	Blue	62		
042	4	Blue	35	X	
043	4	Blue	53		
044	4	Blue	81		
045	4	Blue	11	X	
046	4	Blue	50		
047	4	Blue	18		E 9/24[3]
048	4	Blue	49		
049	4	Blue	86		
050	4	Blue	39	X	Moved
051	4	Blue	3	X	
052	4	Blue	43		
053	4	Blue	55		
054	4	Blue	27	X	
055	4	Blue	41		
056	4	Blue	45		
057	4	Blue	44		Moved
058	4	Blue	58		
059	4	Blue	41		
060	4	Blue	62		
061	4	Blue	73		
062	4	Blue	32	X	
063	4	Blue	44		Moved
064	4	Blue	57		
065	4	Blue	50		
066	4	Blue	60		
067	4	Blue	27	X	
068	4	Blue	4	X	
069	4	Blue	70		
070	4	Blue	69		
071	4	Blue	89		
072	4	Blue	65		Moved
073	4	Blue	53		
074	4	Blue	43		
075	5	Blue	91		GATE
076	5	Blue	199		GATE
077	5	Blue	178		GATE
078	5	Blue	113		GATE

[3] Student entered school on this date.

Table A-2
Initial and Eight-week Assessment Scores for Green and Yellow Track Students

Student ID	Teacher ID	Track	Score on initial assessment	Received tutoring	Score on eight-wk. assess.	Gain/ loss	Special notes
079	1	Green	31	X	50	+39	
080	1	Green	47		57	+10	
081	1	Green	50		--	--	
082	1	Green	56		105	+49	
083	1	Green	41	X	52	+11	
084	1	Green	--		--	--	
085	1	Green	39		44	-5	
086	1	Green	57		59	+2	
087	1	Green	27	X	36	+9	
088	8	Green	43		52	+9	
089	8	Green	36		49	+13	
090	8	Green	57		111	+54	
091	8	Green	50		69	+7	
092	8	Green	29	X	40	+11	
093	8	Green	68		81	+13	
094	8	Green	44		49	+5	
095	8	Green	52		99	+47	
096	8	Green	48		67	+19	
097	8	Green	61		107	+46	
098	8	Green	62		114	+52	
099	8	Green	46		65	+19	
100	8	Green	44		51	+7	
101	8	Green	29		65	+36	
102	8	Green	64		114	+50	
103	8	Green	44		--	--	Moved
104	8	Green	NES[2]		--	--	Moved
105	8	Green	35		49	+14	RSP/S[1]
106	8	Green	51		67	+16	
107	8	Green	61		84	+23	
108	8	Green	NES		--	--	Moved
109	8	Green	18		15	-3	
110	8	Green	33		56	+23	
111	8	Green	69		168	+99	
112	8	Green	53		75	-22	
113	8	Green	21	X	35	+14	
114	8	Green	51		57	+6	
115	8	Green	10	X	41	+31	
116	6	Yellow	32		65	+33	
117	6	Yellow	--	X	60	--	
118	6	Yellow	59		68	+9	

[1] Special education student; [2] Non-English speaking student.

table continues

Student ID	Teacher ID	Track	Score on initial assessment	Received tutoring	Score on eight-wk. assess.	Gain/ loss	Special notes
119	6	Yellow	54		67	+13	
120	6	Yellow	53		58	+5	
121	6	Yellow	51		52	+1	
122	6	Yellow	78		83	+5	
123	6	Yellow	54		63	+9	Moved
124	6	Yellow	16	X	--	--	E 9/24[3]
125	6	Yellow	9	X	21	+13	
126	6	Yellow	--		--	--	E 9/24
127	6	Yellow	63		67	+4	
128	6	Yellow	72		76	+4	
129	6	Yellow	56		57	+1	
130	7	Yellow	68		79	+11	
131	7	Yellow	57		82	+25	
132	7	Yellow	32	X	37	+5	
133	7	Yellow	--		22	--	
134	7	Yellow	--		--	--	E 9/24
135	7	Yellow	65		75	+12	
136	7	Yellow	51		60	+9	
137	7	Yellow	51		55	+4	
138	7	Yellow	59		68	+9	
139	7	Yellow	56	X	64	+8	
140	7	Yellow	11	X	--	--	E 9/24
141	7	Yellow	120		157	+37	GATE[4]
142	7	Yellow	--	X	53	--	
143	7	Yellow	35	X	35	0	
144	7	Yellow	7	X	22	+15	
145	7	Yellow	--		--	--	E 9/24
146	7	Yellow	23		57	+34	
147	7	Yellow	--		60	--	
148	7	Yellow	57		67	+10	
149	7	Yellow	43	X	40	-3	
150	7	Yellow	--		--	--	E 9/24
151	7	Yellow	12	X	33	+21	
152[5]	6	Yellow	39		35	-4	
153	6	Yellow	41		48	+7	
154	6	Yellow	19		32	+13	
155	6	Yellow	11	X	11	0	
156	6	Yellow	--	X	13	--	

[3] Date student entered school; [4] Student identified as gifted and talented; [5] Students 152—175 receive Success for All instruction in Spanish.

table continues

Student ID	Teacher ID	Track	Score on initial assessment	Received tutoring	Score on eight-week assess.	Gain/ loss	Special notes
157	6	Yellow	7		18	+11	
158	6	Yellow	35		35	0	
159	6	Yellow	44		86	+42	
160	6	Yellow	42		36	-6	
161	6	Yellow	36		36	0	
162	6	Yellow	10	X	13	+3	
163	6	Yellow	48		43	-5	
164	6	Yellow	72		95	+23	
165	6	Yellow	69		95	+26	
166	6	Yellow	29		20	-9	
167	7	Yellow	--		72	--	
168	7	Yellow	11		14	+3	
169	7	Yellow	8		11	+3	
170	7	Yellow	7	X	9	+2	
171	7	Yellow	4	X	7	+3	
172	7	Yellow	24		43	+19	
173	7	Yellow	32		37	+5	
174	7	Yellow	7		19	+12	
175	7	Yellow	2	X	6	+4	

STORYTELLING AND RETELLING ESPAÑOL

LESSONS 1—50

DRAFT

Dear Educator,

The Storytelling and Retelling (STaR) Español lessons contained in these notebooks were developed by Tim Harvey, Reyna Rico, Melinda Eastman, Yolanda Hernandez, and Martha Carranza, teachers at Longfellow Elementary School in consultation with staff from the Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory (SWRL).

The STaR lessons are Spanish adaptations of the Johns Hopkins' University successful educational model—Success For All (SFA), and have been designed for use with your Spanish-speaking and Limited English Proficient (LEP) prekindergarteners through first graders. The structure and sequence of STaR lessons parallel the Success for All English model. Instruction consists of a set of storytelling and questioning techniques that have been designed to improve student comprehension and understanding of basic story elements, moving from lower level to higher cognitive analyses.

Please note that this first set of lessons is in final draft form, ready to be field tested in your classrooms. We welcome your input, and therefore, ask that you direct your questions and comments on the lessons to the Success for All coordinator at your school. We appreciate your assistance and look forward to receiving your input.

Sincerely,

Lillian Vega-Castaneda
Curriculum Coordinator
Southwest Regional Laboratory

LIST OF STORYTELLING AND RETELLING TITLES

STAR ESPAÑOL—MASTER LIST OF FINAL DRAFTS

JULY 1, 1991

(REVISED AUG. 7, 1991)

1. El Chivo en la Huerta
2. Los Bribones
3. La Oveja Negra
4. El Patito Feo
5. Nadarín
6. Frederick
7. Corduroy
8. El Muchacho en la Gaveta
9. Dóndé Viven los Monstruos
10. El Bebé de los Osos Berenstein
11. La Gallinita Roja
12. ¡Buenas Noches, Búho!
13. La Princesa Vestida Con Una Bolsa de Papel
14. Martin Hace un Dibujo
15. El Oso Más Elegante
16. Los Tres Osos y Bucles de Oro
17. La Oruga Muy Hambrienta
18. ¡Manzano, Manzano!
19. El Rojo es el Mejor
20. Una Pesadilla en Mi Armario
21. Los Tres Chivos Vivos
22. Un Día de Nieve
23. El hombrecito de pan jenigbre
24. El Papá de David
25. Pequeno Coala Busca Casa
26. La Gallinita, el Gallo, y el Frijol

27. Los Seis Deseos de la Jirafa
28. Quién Será Mi Mamá?
29. Cenicienta
30. Blanca Nieves y los Siete Enanitos
31. Hansel y Gretel
32. Jorgito
33. Hoy Fué Mi Primer Dia de Escuela
34. El Sastrecillo Valienté
35. El Tren de Navidad
36. Agú, Agú, Agú
37. Los Tres Cerditos
38. Harry y el Terrible Quiensabequé
39. Quién Eres Ratoncito?
40. Gorilita
41. Ferdinando
42. Pulgas, el Perro de Jose Luis
43. El Triste Historia del Sol
44. Bingo el Oso
45. El Leon y el Ratón
46. La Montaña de los Osos
47. La Perla
48. El Gato con Botas
49. Caperucita Roja
50. Jorge el Curioso

STORY TELLING AND RETELLING (STaR)

Part I / Program Description

Story Telling (Day 1)

1. Story Introduction

Storytelling is structured to increase the effectiveness of storytelling time. The introduction to the story takes about 5 minutes. It sets the stage and piques the curiosity of the students for the story they will hear. The story guide sheets include some suggested ways to introduce and prepare students for the stories they are about to hear. A typical strategy is to have children look at the front of the book and guess what the story might be about and/or to suggest the characters in the story.

Prior to the reading of the story, unfamiliar vocabulary words are introduced. The STaR Sheets suggest several of these words. You may wish to substitute other words, but it is a good idea to keep the vocabulary word list to no more than three words.

The last part of the introduction establishes the setting for the story. It is important to give the children some idea of when and where the story takes place to prepare them for what they are about to hear.

2. Story Telling

The next part of the storytelling is the actual reading of the story. The story kits suggest critical points in the story to summarize the story and to ask predictive questions. We have observed that frequent summary questions as you continue through the reading greatly helps the children recall the events in the story. Again, the STaR sheets provide suggestions for the frequency and types of questions which may be helpful. However, these are not rigid protocols, but should be viewed as suggestions. The important thing is for you to maintain the rhythm of the story while inserting enough summary questions to facilitate recall. Predictive questions are also useful to keep students involved and thinking about the story.

3. Story Review

At the end of the actual reading, you may use the summary questions to assist you in reviewing the story with the students. You will always want to ask students to recall the title of the book using choral responding to tell the title. The names and descriptions of the main characters are also important to recall. The sequence cards may be used to help you review the events in the story.

Source: Karweit, N., Coleman, M.A., Waclawiw, I., and Petza, R. Teacher's manual: Success for All project, Baltimore City Public Schools, Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools, 9/90.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Overview of Story Retelling sequence for Day 2

Time	Activity	
10 min.	**Story Review**	Title Vocabulary Characters - use sequence cards Events - use sequence cards
20 min.	**Group Retelling**	Sequence Cards Dramatization Role Play
20 min.	**Individual Retelling**	Conference with assistant Peer retell

Overview of activities and groupings for STaR

	Storytelling			
Time	Activity (X)	Grouping	Teacher	Assistant
5 min.	Introducing Story	All	X	Prep retell
20 min.	Storytelling	All	X	Prep retell
10 min.	Story Review	All	X	Prep retell
	Story Retelling			
10 min.	Review	All	X	Prep retell
5 min.	Teacher retell	All	X	X
20 min.	Group retell Individual retell	All 1-3 students	X X	X

Overview of Story Telling sequence for Day 1

Time	Activity	
5 min.	Story Introduction	Setting/theme Vocabulary Predictive questions
20 min.	Storytelling	Summarize Predict Main Idea
10 min.	Story Review	Title Characters Events

Story Retelling (Day 2)

4 & 5. Group and Individual Retelling

The purpose of story retelling is to give students an opportunity to make the story their own, to comprehend the nature of stories, to enhance vocabulary, and to improve oral language skills. Without active involvement of the students in recounting what they have just heard, many of the benefits of storytelling are lost. The story retelling is therefore a critical and integral part of this program. As mentioned in the overview, the story kits include questions for story retell as well as sequence cards which can be used as aides for story retelling. There are two forms of story retelling - the group reteli and the individual student retell. The individual retell allows a student to practice telling a story from beginning to end. The assistant carries out the individual story retell while the teacher is conducting a group retell with the rest of the class. In a twenty minute period, the assistant can usually listen to story retell from three to five children.

Alternate means of story retelling include dramatization of the story, partner retelling and create another ending retelling.

REFERENCES

Alderman, D. L., & Holland, P. W. (1981). *Item performance across language groups on the test of English as a foreign language.* TOEFL Research Report No. 9. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Alderman, D. L. (1982). Language proficiency as a moderator variable in testing academic aptitude. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74,* 580-87.

Chen, A., & Henning, G. (1985). Linguistic and cultural bias in language proficiency tests. *Language Testing, 2,* 155-63.

Comer, J. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American, 259,* 42-48.

Diaz, R. M. (1983). Thought in two languages: The impact of bilingualism on cognitive development. In E. Gordon (Ed.), *Review of research in education,* 10. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Duran, R. P. (1983). *Hispanics' education and background: Predictors of college achievement.* New York, NY: College Entrance Examination Board.

Duran, R. P., Enright, M. K., & Rock, D. A. (1985). *Language factors in Hispanic freshmen's student profile.* College Board Report No. 85-3. New York, NY: College Entrance Examination Board.

Durrell, D., & Catterson, J. (1980). *Durrell analysis of reading difficulty.* New York, NY: Psychological Corporation.

Fact Sheet 1990-91. (1990). Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Guthrie, J. W., Kirst, M. W., Odden, A. E., Koppich, J. E., Hayward, G. R., Adams, J. E., Geeting, G., & Webb, F. R. (1991). *Conditions of education in California 1990.* Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE).

Karweit, N. L. (1988). *Storytelling and retelling: STaR: Teacher's manual.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Lawton, M. (1991, February 13). Researchers' ambitious pledge at a Baltimore school: 'Success for All' students in early elementary grades. *Education Week.*

Low achievers can catch up: Chapter 1 expects more of schools. (1991, January/February). *Harvard Educational Letter, 7* (1), 1-3.

Madden, N. A., & Livermon, B. J. (1989). *Success for All: Beginning reading.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Madden, N. A., Salvin, R. E., Karweit, N. K., & Livermon, B. J. (1989, February). *Restructuring the urban elementary school.* Educational Leadership.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1991, April). Success for All. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 593-599.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Shaw, A., Mainzer, K. L., Leighjton, M., Petza, R., Coleman, M. A., and Haxby, B. (1991, April). *Success for All: Multi-year effects of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Mumm, N., Secord, W., & Dykstra, K. (1980). *Merrill language screening test.* New York, NY: Psychological Corporation.

Newcomer, P. L., & Hammill, D. D. (1988). *Test of language development* 2. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Olmedo, E. L. (1977). Psychological testing and the Chicano. In J. L. Martinez (Ed.), *Chicano psychology.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Padilla, A. M. (1979). Critical factors in the testing of Hispanic Americans: A review and some suggestions for the future. In R. W. Tyler & S. H. Whites (Eds.), *Testing, teaching, and learning.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Schmitt, A. P. (1988). Language and cultural characteristics that explain differential functioning for Hispanic examinees on the scholastic aptitude test. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 25,* 1-13.

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991, April). *Success for All and language minority students.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L, & Wasik, B. A. (1990b, April). *Success for All: Effects of variations in duration and resources of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N. L., Livermon, B. J., & Dolan, L. (1990a). Success for All: First-year outcomes of a comprehensive plan for reforming urban education. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*(2), 255-278.

Wasik, B. A., & Madden, N. A. (1989). *Success for All: Tutoring manual.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Wasik, B. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Preventing reading failure with one-on-one tutoring: A best evidence synthesis.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Woodcock, R. W. (1984). *Woodcock language proficiency battery.* Allen, TX: DLM.